1 2 3 4 5	ISABELLE L. ORD (Bar No. 198224) isabelle.ord@us.dlapiper.com ELIZABETH C. CALLAHAN (Bar No. 323510) elizabeth.callahan@us.dlapiper.com <b>DLA PIPER LLP (US)</b> 555 Mission Street, Suite 2400 San Francisco, CA 94105-2933 Tel: 415.836.2500	Alex R. Straus, Esq. (Bar No. 321366) alex@milberg.com MILBERG COLEMAN BRYSON PHILLIPS GROSSMAN, PLLC 280 S. Beverly Drive, Suite PH Beverly Hills, CA 90212 Tel: 865.247.00080			
6					
7	CHRISTOPHER M. YOUNG (Bar No. 163319) christopher.young@us.dlapiper.com	Charles J Crueger, Esq. (pro hac vice) cjc@cruegerdickinson.com			
8	ALEXANDER E. WOLF (Bar No. 299775)	Ben Kaplan, Esq. (pro hac vice)			
9	alexander.wolf@us.dlapiper.com <b>DLA PIPER LLP (US)</b>	bak@cruegerdickinson.com CRUEGER DICKINSON LLC			
10	401 B Street, Suite 1700	4532 North Oakland Avenue			
	San Diego, CA 92101 Tel: 619.699.2700	Whitefish Bay, WI 53211 T: (414) 210-3868			
11		, ,			
12	Attorneys for Defendant TTE TECHNOLOGY, INC.	Attorneys for PLAINTIFFS			
13					
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
15	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
	_ , , , _ , _ , _ , , _ , _ , _	of California			
16	MARK PACANA, PAUL FISKRATTI, and	CASE NO. 3:20-CV-02857-EMC			
16 17	MARK PACANA, PAUL FISKRATTI, and WAYNE LEWALD, individually and on behalf	CASE NO. 3:20-CV-02857-EMC			
	MARK PACANA, PAUL FISKRATTI, and	CASE NO. 3:20-CV-02857-EMC  JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING			
17	MARK PACANA, PAUL FISKRATTI, and WAYNE LEWALD, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	CASE NO. 3:20-CV-02857-EMC  JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING THE PARTIES' RESPONSE TO ORDER RE SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING			
17 18	MARK PACANA, PAUL FISKRATTI, and WAYNE LEWALD, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,  Plaintiffs,	CASE NO. 3:20-CV-02857-EMC  JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING THE PARTIES' RESPONSE TO ORDER			
17 18 19	MARK PACANA, PAUL FISKRATTI, and WAYNE LEWALD, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,  Plaintiffs,  v.	CASE NO. 3:20-CV-02857-EMC  JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING THE PARTIES' RESPONSE TO ORDER RE SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING AND/OR EVIDENCE			
17 18 19 20 21	MARK PACANA, PAUL FISKRATTI, and WAYNE LEWALD, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,  Plaintiffs,  v.  TTE TECHNOLOGY, INC., dba TCL NORTH	CASE NO. 3:20-CV-02857-EMC  JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING THE PARTIES' RESPONSE TO ORDER RE SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING			
17 18 19 20 21 22	MARK PACANA, PAUL FISKRATTI, and WAYNE LEWALD, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,  Plaintiffs,  v.  TTE TECHNOLOGY, INC., dba TCL NORTH AMERICA,	CASE NO. 3:20-CV-02857-EMC  JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING THE PARTIES' RESPONSE TO ORDER RE SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING AND/OR EVIDENCE  Judge: Hon. Edward M. Chen			
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MARK PACANA, PAUL FISKRATTI, and WAYNE LEWALD, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,  Plaintiffs,  v.  TTE TECHNOLOGY, INC., dba TCL NORTH AMERICA,	CASE NO. 3:20-CV-02857-EMC  JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING THE PARTIES' RESPONSE TO ORDER RE SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING AND/OR EVIDENCE  Judge: Hon. Edward M. Chen			
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MARK PACANA, PAUL FISKRATTI, and WAYNE LEWALD, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,  Plaintiffs,  v.  TTE TECHNOLOGY, INC., dba TCL NORTH AMERICA,	CASE NO. 3:20-CV-02857-EMC  JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING THE PARTIES' RESPONSE TO ORDER RE SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING AND/OR EVIDENCE  Judge: Hon. Edward M. Chen			
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	MARK PACANA, PAUL FISKRATTI, and WAYNE LEWALD, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,  Plaintiffs,  v.  TTE TECHNOLOGY, INC., dba TCL NORTH AMERICA,	CASE NO. 3:20-CV-02857-EMC  JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING THE PARTIES' RESPONSE TO ORDER RE SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING AND/OR EVIDENCE  Judge: Hon. Edward M. Chen			
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	MARK PACANA, PAUL FISKRATTI, and WAYNE LEWALD, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,  Plaintiffs,  v.  TTE TECHNOLOGY, INC., dba TCL NORTH AMERICA,	CASE NO. 3:20-CV-02857-EMC  JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING THE PARTIES' RESPONSE TO ORDER RE SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING AND/OR EVIDENCE  Judge: Hon. Edward M. Chen			
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	MARK PACANA, PAUL FISKRATTI, and WAYNE LEWALD, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,  Plaintiffs,  v.  TTE TECHNOLOGY, INC., dba TCL NORTH AMERICA,	CASE NO. 3:20-CV-02857-EMC  JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING THE PARTIES' RESPONSE TO ORDER RE SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING AND/OR EVIDENCE  Judge: Hon. Edward M. Chen			

1	Plaintiffs Mark Pacana, Paul Fiskratti, and Wayne Lewald (collectively, "Plaintiffs") and
2	Defendant TTE Technology Inc. dba TCL North America ("TCL"), by and through their
3	respective counsel of record, hereby stipulate and agree to the following, subject to Court
4	approval:
5	WHEREAS, Plaintiffs filed their Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Settlement and
6	Direction of Notice Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e) (Doc. 120) (the "Motion") on February 15, 2022,
7	and Defendant filed its Memorandum in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of
8	Class Settlement (Doc. 121) on March 1, 2022;
9	WHEREAS, on March 31, 2022, the Court ordered the parties to provide "Supplemental
10	Briefing and/or Evidence" on various aspects of the Settlement Agreement and the corresponding
11	Notice Plan (Doc. 125) (the "Order") by April 7, 2022;
12	WHEREAS, the Court will hold a hearing on the Motion on April 21, 2022, and the parties
13	will provide a status report by April 14, 2022 (Doc. 124);
14	WHEREAS, the parties are in the process of meeting and conferring on this the issues the
15	Court raised, including but not limited to discussing potential modifications to the Settlement
16	Agreement; and
17	WHEREAS, the parties have also contacted both the class administrator as well as the
18	mediator, Hon. Judge Gandhi (Ret.) of JAMS to assist in working through the Order's issues and
19	questions, but anticipate that additional time will be necessary to fully respond to the Order;
20	THEREFORE, the parties request one additional week, until April 14, 2022, to respond to
21	the Order.
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	1

## 

1	Dated: April 5, 2022	DLA PIPER LLP (US)	
2		Pur /c/ Inaballa I Ord	
3		By: <u>/s/ Isabelle L. Ord</u> ISABELLE L. ORD	
4		CHRISTOPHER M. YOUNG Attorneys for Defendant	
5		TTE TECHNOLOGY, INC.	
6			
7	Dated: April 5, 2022	CRUEGER DICKINSON LLC	
8		By: /s/ Charles Crueger <sup>1</sup>	
9		CHARLES J. CRUEGER BEN KAPLAN	
10		GREG G. COLEMAN	
11		Attorneys for Plaintiffs CHRISTOPHER JULIAN, MARK PACANA,	
12		PAUL FISKRATTI, and WAYNE LEWALD	
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27	Durguent to N.D. Cal. Civ. I. D. 5	5 1(i)(2) I haraby attact that the consumance to the filing of this	
28	<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to N.D. Cal. Civ. L.R. 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that the concurrence to the filing of this document has been obtained from each signatory hereto.		
		2	

1	[PROPOSED] ORDER	
2	Having considered the parties' Stipulation, and good cause appearing therefore, the Court	
3	hereby GRANTS the parties' Stipulation. It is HEREBY ORDERED that the response to the	
4	Order Re Supplemental Briefing and/or Evidence shall be due no later than April 14, 2022.	
5		
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
7		
8	Dated: The Honorable Edward M. Chen	
9	United States District Judge	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19 20		
20		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	3	